

REMARKS

Claims 1, 12, 32, 37 and 43 have been amended. Claims 1 – 23, 25 – 43, 46 and 47 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the following comments, applicant respectfully requests the application be allowed and forwarded to issuance.

5

Interview Summary

Applicant's attorney, Lance R. Sadler, wishes to thank Examiner Jamie Vent for the time spent interviewing this application on July 24, 2007. During the interview, the rejections over the reference to Vallone were discussed. Applicant proposed some claim clarifications, which are indicated above, which address and overcome the examiner's rejections. The examiner agreed that such claim clarifications would overcome the current rejections. The examiner agreed to call the undersigned representative after conducting a subsequent search. Applicant sincerely appreciates the examiner's willingness to work with applicant in advancing prosecution.

10

15

Rejections under § 103

Claims 1 – 11 and 37 – 44 and 46 – 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vallone et al (US 6,642,939) in view of Browne (WO 92/22983).

Claims 12 - 23 and 25 - 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vallone et al (US 6,642,939) in view of Inuoe et al (5,832,085).

20

The Claims

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the time shifting of the first and second broadcast data streams uses, at least in part, the respective first and second encoding formats. During the above-identified interview, the examiner agreed that such amendment would overcome the cited references. Claims 2-11 are allowable as depending from claim 1.

25

Claim 12 has been amended to recite that the rendering comprises rendering components of the first digital data stream and rendering components of the second digital stream using, at least in part, the respective first and second encoding formats. During the above-identified interview, the examiner agreed that such amendment would

30

overcome the cited references. Claims 13-23 and 25-31 are allowable as depending from claim 12.

Claim 32 has been amended to recite that the rendering can render components of the at least two broadcast streams using, at least in part, the respective encoding format in which said at least two broadcast streams are encoded. During the above-identified interview, the examiner agreed that such amendment would overcome the cited references. Claimed 33-36 are allowable as depending from claim 32.

Claim 37 has been amended to recite that components of the first and second broadcast data stream can be rendered using, at least in part, the respective encoding format in which a respective broadcast data stream is encoded. During the above-identified interview, the examiner agreed that such amendment would overcome the cited references. Claims 38-42 are allowable as depending from claim 37.

Claim 43 has been amended to recite that the rendering module is configured to render a data stream using, at least in part, a data stream's encoded format. During the above-identified interview, the examiner agreed that such amendment would overcome the cited references. Claims 46-47 are allowable as depending from claim 43.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Office issue a Notice of Allowability. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: August 8, 2007

By: /Allan T. Sponseller, Reg. #38,318/

Allan T. Sponseller (38,318) for:
Lance R. Sadler
Reg. No.38605
(509) 755-7251